

-7-

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

OCT 11 2006

**Wu et al.
Appl. No. 10/017,793**

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment to the Claims, claims 1-10, 20, 23, 24, and 27-31 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 20, 24, 28, and 30 are independent. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 20, 23, 30, and 31 are sought to be amended. Claims 13-16 and 19 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is embraced by this amendment and its entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above Amendment and the remarks set forth below, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections.

Examiner Interview

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courteous telephonic interview held on September 15, 2006. Applicants would also like to thank the Examiner for the courteous Examiner interview held at the USPTO on October 4, 2006.

In the Claims

The Examiner, on page 2 of the Final Office Action, has indicated that Applicants have inadvertently designated claim 18 as original when they intended to designate claim 18 as cancelled. Applicants have corrected this mistake by indicating that claim 18 has been cancelled in the Amendments to Claims section of this Response.

-8-

Wu et al.
Appl. No. 10/017,793

The Specification

The Examiner, on page 2 of the Final Office Action, has indicated that the amendment filed on 4/7/2006 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. Applicants' representative did not write this case and mistakenly thought that a typographical error had been made when reference number 172 was changed to 175. The Examiner is correct in indicating that reference number 175 refers to "article 175" on page 11 of the original disclosure. Applicants have amended the Specification to remove the inadvertently changed reference number of 175 from 172 on page 8 of the Specification.

As discussed at the Examiner Interview on October 4, 2006, Applicants have further amended the Specification by removing reference numbers 170, 172, and 174 from the Specification (as well as the drawing Figure 1) to overcome the drawing objections. Applicants respectfully request that the Specification be amended as indicated by the Amendment to the Specification on page 2 of this Response.

The Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for the following reasons: (1) different reference characters seem to designate the same element (172, 174), reference characters are used incorrectly (175), and reference characters in the specification are not found in the drawings (174). Applicants have attached a replacement drawing sheet for original FIG. 1. The Examiner has indicated that reference numbers 170, 172, and 100 all seem to be pointing to the same elements. Applicant has deleted reference numbers 170 and 172 in the replacement drawing. Reference number 100 has been placed outside

-9-

Wu et al.
Appl. No. 10/017,793

of the oval circle to indicate that reference number 100 refers to all of the elements designated in FIG. 1. Support for moving reference number 100 outside of the oval circle is found in the Specification on pages 5-8. Reference numbers 170 and 172 have also been deleted from the Specification.

In the replacement drawing for FIG. 1, reference character 175 has been moved within the oval circle of FIG. 1 to indicate article 175 as being items 122 and 177. Support for designating article 175 as items 122 and 177 may be found in the Specification on page 11, lines 4-11, which refers to article 175 as "a memory system, ..., comprising a machine-accessible medium 122 having associated data 177, which when accessed, results in a machine performing such actions as executing a plurality of instructions using a main pipeline and a run-ahead pipeline which share an instruction cache and a data cache."

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the Examiner states that the second processor of claims 13-16 and 19 is not shown.

Applicants have cancelled claims 13-16 and 19, thereby rendering this objection moot. Applicants have also amended the Specification to delete the reference number 174 which was omitted from the drawings. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner review the replacement drawing sheet for FIG. 1 and withdraw the objections to FIG. 1.

Applicants have also submitted a replacement drawing for FIG. 2. No changes have been made in the replacement drawing for FIG. 2. The replacement drawing for FIG. 2 is being submitted as a more formal drawing sheet.

-10-

Wu et al.
Appl. No. 10/017,793

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second para.

The Examiner, on page 4 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 13-16 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that the inconsistency between Applicants' original drawings and the claim language renders the scope of the claims indefinite. Applicants have cancelled claims 13-16 and 19, thereby rendering this rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner, on page 5 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 20, 23, and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner states that Applicants defined a "machine accessible medium: to be "an electrical, optical, or electromagnetic conductor" on page 11 of their specification. Applicants have amended the preamble of independent claims 20 and 30 to replace "An article comprising a tangible machine accessible medium having associated data, wherein the medium causes a computer to perform the following ..." with "An article comprising a tangible computer-readable medium with instructions stored thereon that when executed cause a computer to perform the following" Applicants have amended dependent claims 23 and 31 to replace the phrase "tangible machine accessible medium" with "tangible computer-readable medium." Applicants believe that the amendment of claims 20, 23, 30, and 31 overcomes this rejection. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner review amended claims 20, 23, 30, and 31, and withdraw this rejection.

-11-

Wu et al.
Appl. No. 10/017,793

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating, on page 5 of the Office Action, that claims 1-10, [20], 24, and 27-29 are allowable over the prior art of record.

RECEIVED
-12- CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Wu et al.
OCT 11 2006 Appl. No. 10/017,793

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Dated: October 11, 2006

/Crystal D. Sayles, Reg. No. 44,318/
Crystal D. Sayles
Senior Attorney
Intel Americas, Inc.
(202) 588-1959

c/o Intel Americas, Inc.
4040 Lafayette Center Drive
Building LF2
Chantilly, VA 20151